

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 11, 1992

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DERRICK].

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 8, 1992.

I hereby designate the Honorable BUTLER DERRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, May 11, 1992.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We remember in our hearts, gracious God, those who seek Your healing, Your direction, Your forgiveness, and Your blessing. We pray for ourselves and those we love, and all people whose lives are in conflict and need support. For all the generations Your Word has brought strength to those who felt weak and new hope to those who felt alone. May Your peace, O God, that passes all human understanding, be with us and all Your people now and evermore. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. RICHARDSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## LET US WELCOME CHILE TO FREE-TRADE ALLIANCE

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, remember the old days when we associated the nation of Chile with repression, Pinochet, and the Letelier murder in the streets of Washington? Those are the old days. Today Chile is a vibrant democracy with a freely elected government and a market economy that is the most advanced in Latin America. Its President, Patricio Aylwin, who arrives in Washington today, is a progressive leader who has brought stability and economic prosperity to his country.

Chile wants to join Mexico and Canada in negotiating a free-trade agreement with the United States. Mr. Speaker, this makes sense. Let us get our hemisphere together before the Japanese and European trading blocs overtake us and make us less competitive internationally.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of a letter sent to the President on May 7 by a number of my colleagues and myself.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 7, 1992.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The upcoming visit of President Patricio Aylwin of Chile will provide an opportunity for the United States to strengthen its friendship with the newly democratic government of Chile and further the objectives of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. One issue for discussion during the visit is the question of when the United States and Chile will begin negotiations leading to a Free Trade Agreement. In our view, it is important that the United States begin these talks soon.

Recent events in Peru and Venezuela are dramatic reminders to all of us of the fragility of the democratic successes in our hemisphere in the last decade. The United States should do what it can to strengthen democracy in South America.

A Free Trade Agreement with Chile would also promote U.S. economic growth by guaranteeing access to new markets and increasing investment opportunities in Chile.

Your Administration has identified a Free Trade Agreement with Chile as the next logical step in the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. In this regard, however, there seems to be some concern with initiating the process for negotiations before the completion of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). We would like to point out that the NAFTA negotiations need not be a bar to an announcement that the Administration will begin the process leading to negotiation of a Free Trade Agreement with Chile.

An announcement and notification to the Congress of the Administration's intention to enter into negotiations would simply allow the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance

to begin their preliminary review of the Free Trade Agreement and set the stage for negotiations at a later time specified by the Administration. In the meantime, the demonstrated intention of the United States to enter into negotiations would be an important signal to Chile of our partnership.

Sincerely,

Bill Richardson, Beryl Anthony, Jr., Sam Gibbons, Jim Kolbe, Ray McGrath, David Dreier, Amo Houghton, Tim Penny, John Miller, Fred Grandy, Jim Leach.

## CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE AMENDMENT

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1789 James Madison proposed an amendment to the Constitution that would bar congressional pay raises from taking effect until after another election.

Congress approved the idea in 1789 and it was sent along to the States for ratification along with the 10 amendments that became the Bill of Rights.

During the next 105 years seven States ratified the proposed amendment. However, in the 1980's 30 more States approved it, 1 short of the required 38.

Now Michigan has ratified the amendment, and Congress should move promptly in a sound, constitutionally correct, manner.

The proper course is for Congress to enact a joint resolution noting that 38 States have approved the amendment but that 7 of the approvals were not contemporaneous, some approvals being enacted more than 200 years ago.

These seven States should be urged to promptly vote again, so that any doubts regarding their approval today would be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1992]

### HISTORY'S LONG, ANGRY ARM

Congressional pay ignites voters in the calmest of times; in this era of anger at politics, the issue has become positively incendiary. Four state legislatures this week reached back 203 years to restrain Congress in setting its members' pay. They ratified a constitutional amendment to that effect, one that made sense when James Madison offered it in 1789 and still does. But the long lapse in its ratification begs for updating.

This week's approvals gave the amendment a three-fourths majority of the 50 states. It's now up to the National Archivist or Congress to determine whether the ratifications of states that voted long ago remain valid.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The pending proposal would bar Congressional pay raises from taking effect until after another election, which should make members think twice before they act. In truth, they already do. Pay raises are among the thorniest issues Congress ever confronts. The former Senate majority leader Howard Baker called it "the great-granddaddy conflict of interest of all time."

Members of the First Congress received \$6 for each day they attended—and critics said that was too much, since members of Britain's Parliament got only 6 shillings a day. In 1989, two dozen pay raises and several controversies later, Congress included a provision delaying its latest raise until after the 1990 election. The House observed that rule. The Senate rejected the raise at the time, but then voted itself an immediate raise last year.

Congress agreed to the Madison proposal in 1789 and submitted it to the states, along with the 10 amendments that became the Bill of Rights. Only six states ratified the pay amendment in the next few years—Maryland, the Carolinas, Delaware, Vermont and Virginia, Ohio ratified in 1873. It took 105 years for the next state, Wyoming, to approve.

The final push for adoption began in the mid-1980's when a student at the University of Texas discovered the lapse while researching the Equal Rights Amendment and started urging legislatures to act. Last year 43 newly elected House members joined the campaign, as part of their larger effort to reform Congressional procedures.

There is no overall statutory or constitutional deadline for ratification of amendments, but in recent decades each proposal has been assigned a deadline, usually seven years. That's sound practice. It makes ratification an act of its time, not some artifact of the distant past. To remove any doubt about this 27th Amendment, the same principal could be applied now, by getting reconfirmation from the eight states that ratified before the 1980's.

There are other ways Congress might bless the long arm of history, but re-ratification might be the clearest. In any case, whatever way is used to settle the procedural qualms, the substance of the amendment is as welcome to the public as the appearances are to embattled politicians.

#### THE COIN-OPERATED GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON, DC

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, for anyone who likes the idea of a coin-operated Government in Washington, DC, they are going to love the President's veto of the Campaign Finance Reform Act. I am very sad about that veto, because it keeps in place the old adage that those with the most gold rule.

As we remember, just 2 weeks ago the President had dinner in Washington, DC, raising \$9 million. For \$92,000 you could have your picture taken with the President. Hey, if anyone wants their picture taken with me, it is free.

At that time there was guerrilla theater going on outside, pointing out for those who wanted some kind of tax loophole; would they please go through

door 1 for the dinner; for people who wanted ambassadorships, please go through door 2; for people who wanted pardons, please go through door 3.

What a great tragedy. That kind of guerrilla theater is just too close to the truth, and how sad it is that the reform measure we passed has now been vetoed. I certainly hope we can override it, but I certainly wish the President would help us try to clean up the influence of money and special interests in Washington, DC, which is a lot of our problem.

#### BIG MONEY AND BIG SPECIAL INTERESTS SHOULD NOT DOMINATE CONGRESS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], who just spoke on the very issue I will speak about.

Mr. Speaker, there was a very rich irony in today's Washington Post. One story reports that the President has vetoed the campaign finance reform bill, and with it, in my judgment, a chance to once and for all rein in the corrupting influence of special interests and big political action money. And, right next to this story, on the same page, is a story about a shadowy, elusive figure who went to the President's dinner some few weeks ago carrying with him \$400,000 to make a contribution to that bonanza. This man happens to be a shadowy, living-on-the-edge sort of a character, a corrupting influence, it seems to me.

For weeks, Mr. Speaker, I have taken this floor urging the President to sign the finance reform bill into law and make a contribution to recapturing and reenacting the confidence of the American people in the political system. Unfortunately, the President has not taken that advice, nor the advice of many people on his side of the aisle urging him to correct the imbalance in the political playing field.

Mr. Speaker, this body has an obligation to take up the President's action and attempt to veto it. We need to make a statement to the American people that politics should not be dominated by big money and big special interests.

#### THE COUNTERFEIT THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, as long as money has existed, so has the problem of counterfeit. After all, if a paper coupon can be used as a medium of exchange, it has real value—you can get something for it. And if you can

produce a piece of paper yourself and get somebody to give you something valuable for it, you've managed to get something for nothing. The essence of crime is to get something for nothing, or for very little effort, and since counterfeiting is just that kind of thing, it is a very attractive kind of crime. So it should not surprise us that as long as paper money has been widely used, so has the crime of counterfeiting—the crime of creating and using phony money.

Governments spend a great deal of time thinking of ways to prevent counterfeiters from debasing the currency—since, if they have very much success, counterfeiters can literally destroy a large part of any country's monetary base. There are many twists and turns in this peculiar war of printers and engravers and papermakers against one another, and every year this paper war becomes more complex—never more so than it is today.

Unfortunately for us, U.S. paper currency is relatively unsophisticated, relatively easy to counterfeit, and is therefore perhaps the most attractive target in the world to counterfeiters, who are today capable of producing bills of such accuracy that detecting counterfeits is virtually impossible except through the use of sophisticated equipment.

Our Government could do a great deal more than it is to defeat counterfeit operators—but it isn't. Because of this odd and irresponsible passivity, our currency is terribly vulnerable to counterfeiters who are enjoying a growing success in their efforts to get a great many millions for nothing.

The first line of defense in a safe paper currency lies in the paper used. Note paper has to have several qualities—it has to be durable, for one thing. Paper money that falls apart after being soaked in water, for instance is a worthless nuisance. The paper can't wrinkle very much, or get brittle after repeated handling. It has to hold ink, must be capable of resisting a great deal of handling without losing its texture, and it must be a texture that has a certain feel, a feel that people instantly recognize as being authentic. In many ways the biggest problem of the counterfeiter is to get paper that looks and feels right. For this reason, the manufacture and supply of paper for money is carefully guarded.

One way to get paper is very simple, and that is to take one dollar bills and literally launder them, bleaching out the ink. Once that's done, it is possible to produce a pretty decent \$100 bill. But the best way to get good paper is to get the real thing, or find a supply that can pass for the real thing.

U.S. paper currency carries a distinct look—it has tiny red and blue fibers scattered around. There are very few who are capable of reproducing this



kind of paper, which has an instantly recognizable look as well as feel. But it is not impossible to obtain paper that looks and feels right, and today, counterfeiters apparently have little trouble in getting paper that looks and feels like the real thing. Therefore the first line of defense, the paper itself, is no longer reliable in and of itself. Today, in fact, counterfeit \$100 bills are in circulation that feel right, have the red and blue fibers, and look perfect. This counterfeit paper is so good that only chemical or fluorescent light tests can detect it.

If paper security is breached, the second line of defense is in the printing process itself. Our Government uses what is called the intaglio process, which uses extremely high-pressure presses that literally force ink into the paper. A normal printing process simply puts ink on the surface of paper, but intaglio forces the ink actually in the paper itself. This is a process that requires presses of considerable size and great power. Presses of this kind are beyond the reach of just about anyone except governments. But of course these presses are available to many governments, not just ours. And it is therefore possible that counterfeiters can be made on intaglio presses. In fact, there are currently counterfeit \$100 bills in circulation that are clearly printed with the intaglio process—therefore these counterfeiters have the distinct, raised lettering feel of authentic bills. In other words, the two first lines of defense against phony bills have been penetrated—the paper and printing.

The third defense against phony bills lies in the engraving or design. Governments take great care to design a bill that is very hard to duplicate—tiny details are used that involve great skill and artistry. This is not art for the sake of art. Instead it is art that is hard to duplicate. The process includes micro-engraving, and if the tiny dots and swirls are not executed exactly right, the counterfeit is easily recognized. A missing line, a misplaced few dots, will foil a very good counterfeit. But unfortunately counterfeiters no longer have to rely on the eye and hand of a skilled engraver—there is the photocopier. A photocopier makes exact copies, and these copies can be transferred into printed product. Today's counterfeiter is not a lone operator with a press and set of engraving tools, but a crook with a very good photocopier and excellent press. There are some designs that will distort when copied, but sadly for us, these features are not well incorporated into our currency. Therefore as far as U.S. currency is concerned, there is very little protection in the design feature itself. Thus a third defense against counterfeiters is very weak indeed, as far as our currency goes.

Another defense is in the inks used. It is possible to use an ink that

changes color when held against light, a kind of holographic effect—but our government does not do this. It is possible to use inks with a certain electronic or chemical signature, a kind of tag. If this is done, it is possible to process bills for authenticity, even if the printing and engraving of the phony bill is perfect. I am glad to say that inks of this kind are used, but it is by no means certain that counterfeiters won't find a way around this security feature. In any event, the false bills now in circulation look, feel, and have the color of perfectly authentic currency. These counterfeiters can be detected only by mechanical means.

This is why large denomination U.S. bills are being replaced as fast as possible, with a new series that incorporates a relatively new safety feature—the security strip.

The security strip has just one purpose, and that is to defeat photocopying types of counterfeiters. In the new series of \$100 bills, there is a strip imbedded that is visible when held against a light. If you see this strip, you've got a good bill. It is the fact that light makes the strip visible, that makes it a guard against photocopying—any time the copier makes a pass, the strip shows up and spoils the design. Even though this is a very good thing, the security strip is a very tenuous line of defense. We can and should do a great deal more to protect our currency, but the Treasury is continuing the most unimaginative, least aggressive, and most dangerous course possible. If there is a design change, the Treasury wants it to be all but invisible—and so aggressive—in other words, effective—redesign is not considered by the Treasury. If new types of security inks are talked about, the Treasury refuses—and so the least effective new ink features are used. If new paper types are suggested, the Treasury says that somebody else owns the patents, and so we use papers that incorporate not the newest security features, but features—like the security strip—that other governments have used for years, and which therefore have the least promise of being effective for very long. We can do more to protect our currency, and we should, as I will demonstrate.

At the present time, the total amount of currency in circulation is about \$272 billion. About half of this is in the form of \$100 bills, some 150 billion dollars' worth. Of the \$100 bills, about \$100 billion circulate overseas.

The U.S. \$100 bill is used for all kinds of purposes—in some countries it is the preferred form of savings. In others it is the best exchange medium, because its value is more or less reliable. If, for example, you are in Russia the value of the ruble is totally unreliable, so a hard currency like the pound or the dollar or the mark is the best thing to use for trade or to use for saving—so

there is a great demand for U.S. currency in such places.

This demand naturally makes counterfeiting a very attractive proposition, so the U.S. dollar is a favorite target. Not only is there great demand, as I have said, our Treasury's soft steps on security make our currency much easier to counterfeit than, say, the British pound note. If counterfeiters manage to get much phony money into circulation, the value of our currency will be threatened.

Currently, as I have said, there are phony \$100 bills in circulation of stunning quality—they are printed on paper that is virtually identical to authentic U.S. note paper. The engraving is correct, except for one or two tiny micro-engraving details, which are virtually impossible to detect. These bills carry varying serial numbers, so they can't be detected by use of the serials. These particular bills are of authentic coloring, and they are printed impeccably—apparently on intaglio presses.

It is these counterfeiters that have forced the Federal Reserve to recall and destroy old \$100 bills as rapidly as possible, and to replace those bills with the new type incorporating security strips. As I said, about one-third, or \$50 billion, of \$100 bills are circulating in this country. It will take perhaps one more year to replace all the old bills in domestic circulation, in a program that started several months ago.

Overseas, where most of the bills are, it is a different story. These bills do not come into U.S. bank hands very often, and so they are not returned to the Federal Reserve for destruction. In other words, for most \$100 bills, the replacement program will work only slowly, which means that overseas the counterfeiters have a fatter and slower target.

Here in the United States, there has been a relative handful of phony \$100 bills found—the rate recently was about 9 to 11 bills per million processed, amounting to about \$1 million per year. But bills that circulate overseas are not processed by the detection techniques needed to spot the new type of counterfeit, so no one knows what the volume of counterfeiters abroad really is. The trouble is, it could be very big, and if it is, there is a substantial threat to the books of the Federal Reserve, and to the value and acceptability of a very sizable portion of our whole currency base. In other words, better than one-third of our currency base—that is, the \$100 bills circulating abroad—is wide open to the most sophisticated counterfeit operation ever seen.

It is good that the Federal Reserve is working to replace existing \$100 bills. But that is not enough to meet the threat, by any means.

What is needed is a much more aggressive effort to provide secure currency, by the Treasury. The steps it

has taken have been slow, they have been pitifully inadequate, and they make the threat to our currency much more substantial, inviting counterfeiters to do great harm to our country. If Treasury inaction leads to panic, that would be tragic—and it is certainly not impossible for this to happen.

What could be done?

For one thing, there could be a fairly radical revision of our currency—which would make it much more secure.

Great Britain, for example, completely redesigns circulating bills about every 10 years. This is not just to keep things fashionable—it is to prevent counterfeiting. A few years ago, British 50-pound notes were so compromised that the whole series had to be wiped out in very short order. From that time, they started using much better defenses—new paper, new inks, new designs—and today have a much more secure currency. Do we have to wait for a very expensive disaster to do the same kind of thing? I hope not.

One of the best techniques available today is to use a bigger portrait on the bill. The bigger portrait—which you will find on just about every currency in Europe—is much tougher to duplicate. What is better, the type of design used in these portraits cannot be successfully photocopied—a copy comes out with gross distortions that are easily visible to the naked eye. This makes it nearly impossible to produce fake bills that look right. But the Treasury, not wanting to change the way our bills look in any fundamental way, resists the idea of this kind of change.

Another thing that can be done is to use more color. If this is done, the resulting bill not only looks more dramatic, but much more important, is extremely hard to reproduce with the proper effect. It is tougher to print, harder to get the colors right, and harder to get the design straight. Again, most European currency uses much more color than ours—not because it is cute, but because it is more secure and harder to fake. But again, the Treasury resists this idea.

It is fine to use the security strip, but this is of no help when two-thirds of the bills in question are overseas and not likely to be replaced very fast—and meanwhile, the existing bills present a very fat target.

The Treasury should be thinking about much bolder techniques, but is instead playing with small engraving changes and the like. It doesn't even consider very seriously the use of inks that vary with light, and have a distinctive color shift that is very hard to duplicate, and hence safer than present inks. They should be thinking about more radical changes in design, like bigger portraits, more color, and papers with greater security features than the anticopying strip—but they aren't.

All of this invites counterfeiters to trash the \$100 bill, and they are doing so with increasing success.

We know that more can be done to protect our currency. My question is, why isn't it? Is it because the Treasury wants our money to look the same always? I say that if it looks like it always has, it won't necessarily be worth anything at all. Is it because the Treasury doesn't want to invest in new designs and methods? I say that if that is so, we might well end up with a currency that is badly compromised—and so very expensive indeed.

We cannot pretend any more that photocopying doesn't exist, or that other people can't get their hands on good currency notepaper, or that they can't get access to intaglio presses, or that they can't come very close to duplicating our inks—they have done all those things. The truth is, there are worthless \$100 bills in circulation—no one knows how many—that are indistinguishable from the real thing, unless you have access to certain mechanical testing devices. These fake bills could not exist if the Treasury had done its job and employed security techniques that are well known, very effective, and used by governments that want a safe currency. What are we waiting for? There is, after all, \$100 billion in \$100 bills abroad that are at great risk, and 50 billion dollars' worth here at home that are at greater risk than they really should be. Is it any wonder our currency is being attacked? Not at all. The wonder is how little we are doing to protect it.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REED, for 60 minutes, on May 12.

Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, on May 13.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MYERS of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. BAKER in three instances.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. COMBEST in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. OWENS of Utah.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA in five instances.

Mr. KENNEDY.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 12, 1992, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3478. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of final priority, required activities, and selection criteria—Cooperative Demonstration Program (school-to-work), pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3479. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of final priority—Cooperative Demonstration Program (correctional education), pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3480. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of the antiterrorism training courses to be offered to the civilian security forces of the Government of Argentina, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-3(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3481. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of the antiterrorism training courses to be offered to the civilian security forces of the Government of Uruguay, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-3(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3482. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Peter Jon de Vos, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tanzania; of Robert E. Gribbon III, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to the Central African Republic, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Dennis P. Barret, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Madagascar; of Richard Goodwin Capen, Jr., of Florida, to be Ambassador to Spain; of William Lacy Swing, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria; of Roger A. McGuire, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea Bissau, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3484. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting notice of a proposed altered records system,



pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(r); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3486. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3487. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a lease prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3488. A letter from the Administrator, General Service Administration, transmitting informational copies of various lease prospectuses, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3489. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage State and local governments to further identify and remove regulatory barriers to affordable housing, to strengthen the link between Federal housing assistance and removal of regulatory barriers, to extend and amend certain laws providing Federal tax incentives for affordable housing, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 452. An Act to

authorize a transfer of administrative jurisdiction over certain land to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1182. An Act to transfer jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Utah to the Forest Service, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Submitted May 8, 1992]

H.R. 3304. Referred to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules extended for a period ending not later than May 15, 1992.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GINGRICH:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the prorating of veterans compensations, dependency and indemnity compensation, and pension for the month in which the death of the payee occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 5131. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to regulate the manufacture, collection, and disposal of batteries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Con. Res. 317. Concurrent resolution declaring the ratification of the 27th article of

amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

415. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the compensation of Members of the U.S. Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1969: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3138: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3146: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 3253: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3258: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 3503: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 4061: Mr. EVANS and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 4168: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4419: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 4944: Mr. SANTORUM.

H.J. Res. 429: Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 467: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. FASCELL.

H. Res. 323: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H. Res. 384: Mr. LENT.